REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending in the application. Claims 1-5 are objected due to various informalities. It is respectfully submitted that the foregoing amendments to the claims eliminate those informalities and moot the objections.

Claims 1 and 2 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as indefinite. The rejection alleges that the limitations "by printing simultaneously, before and after the above-mentioned steps" is unclear. Applicants submit that the amendment to claim 1 clarifies the meaning of the claim and moots the rejection. The amendment is supported by the specification in the paragraph bridging pages 4 and 5. As the amendment is supported by the specification and moots the indefiniteness rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that the claim is in condition of allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection is requested.

Claims 4-5 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over EP 0 945 252 A2 (EP '252) in view of DeLisio et al.

The '252 reference does not render obvious the claimed invention, either alone or in combination with DeLisio. The present invention requires, among other things, an aluminum vapor deposition polyethylene layer obtained by vapor depositing aluminum on linear low density polyethylene obtained by polymerization using metallocene catalyst. Thus, the mLLDPE is used as a substrate of the aluminum vapor deposition layer.

In the '252 reference, however, the mLLDPE layer (B) is superimposed on one side of the aluminum layer (A) by extrusion lamination. (See, e.g., paragraph [0113]). That

is, although the '252 references teaches the use of an mLLDPE layer in combination with an aluminum layer, the reference does not teach or suggest the application of an aluminum layer by vapor deposition on a linear low density polyethylene obtained by a polymerization using metallocene catalyst. Rather, in the extrusion lamination method of the '252 reference, a molten polymer requires at least a support layer on which the polymer is laminated. Likewise, when the aluminum layer (A) is not aluminum foil, but aluminum vapor deposition film, the vaporous aluminum needs a support layer (i.e., "substrate" referred to in paragraph [0016]) on which the aluminum is deposited. In the context of the claimed invention, the molten polymer mLLDPE cannot serve as a solid substrate, neither for the polymer nor for the aluminum vapor deposition. Accordingly, the '252 reference does not teach or suggest the laminate structure of the claimed invention. Thus, the present invention affords the advantages of an aluminum vapor deposition layer directly on an mLLDPE layer while doing away with the need for an intermediate substrate or polyethylene layer. The instant invention thus affords the advantages described at page 14 of the specification, e.g., high heat resisting property at the time of metal vapor deposition, and higher manufacturing speed.

In view of the distinctions described above, the combination of the '252 reference with the DeLisio reference similarly fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention. Thus, the invention of claims 4-5 and 7-8, as well as that of claims 3 and 6, are neither or taught or suggested by the combination of the '252 reference with DeLisio.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims as currently pending are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request formal notification to that effect. If, however, the Examiner perceives any impediments to such a formal notification of allowance, whether it be substantive or formal, the Examiner is encouraged to contact applicants' attorney at the number provided below. Such informal communication will expedite examination and disposition of the present case.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: August 21, 2003

By: _____
Brian P. O'Shaughnessy
Registration No. 32,747

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620